

LUC-438/Benco 33-24-24-27

Remarks

Claims 1-27 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 9, 16 and 22 were previously amended, claims 10-15, and 17-20 are original, claims 1-8, 21, and 23 are cancelled and claims 24-27 are new. These amendments to the claims constitute a bona fide attempt by applicants to advance prosecution of the application and obtain allowance of certain claims, and are in no way meant to acquiesce to the substance of the rejections. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, figures, and claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner alleged that the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Examiner further alleged that the newly added claimed subject matter recited in the claims "event that is associated with a predetermined mobile handset of a plurality of mobile handsets" or "event notification is sent in SMS form from the network to a selected one mobile handset of the plurality of mobile handsets,..." are not included in the original specification.

Page 3, lines 12-13 of the specification states as follows: "In general terms an embodiment of the present system for input of events and subsequent event notification to at least one mobile handset..." Thus this clearly indicates that there a plurality of mobile handsets is contemplated.

Page 2 line 25 to page 3, lines 1-3 of the specification states as follows: "Embodiments of the present system and method provide a network solution for providing the necessary support for event acceptance and reporting, by providing an interface to accept events, and using SMS as

LUC-438/Benco 33-24-24-27

the vehicle to report those events to the designated mobile subscribers." Thus this clearly indicates a multiple number of subscribers, subscribers obviously referring to subscribers having mobile handsets.

Page 5, lines 3-4 of the specification states as follows: "An event may consist of a sequence of characters and an associated mobile handset telephone number." Thus this clearly states that an event is associated with a predetermined handset, which is equivalent to a handset telephone number since each handset has a unique telephone number.

Page 5, lines 13-15 of the specification states as follows: "Upon reception of the input event, the network automatically delivers the message in SMS form to the designated mobile subscriber." Again, it is explained that the event is associated with a designated mobile subscriber.

Therefore, the added claimed subject matter is described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, has been overcome and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the objection and rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over An et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0077062) and further in view of Seshadri et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0002958).

The Examiner also rejected Claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over An et al. (US Pub. No. 2002/0077062) and further in view of Seshadri et al. (US Pub. No. 2004/0002958) and further in view of Sawyer et al. (US Patent 5,946,629).

LUC-438/Benco 33-24-24-27

In paragraph [0009] An et al. explains that "... it is urgently required to provide an on-line service system that can properly provide information on various kinds of events, on-going within a specified building that the customer is visiting, or various kinds of information needed by the customer within the building."

In paragraph [0027] An et al. explains that: "According to the preferred embodiments of the present invention, the shopping center information service system and the operation method thereof provide information data of respective shops, residing in a specified building, that a customer is visiting and information on a sudden event, generated in a specified shop in the building, to a mobile terminal of the customer."

It is clear that one skilled in the art would look to An et al. when it is unimportant that the customers and their mobile terminals be identifiable. Therefore, if one skilled in the art needed to consider the identity of a mobile terminal An et al. would not be considered; and if one skilled in the art need not consider the identity of a mobile terminal Seshadri et al. would not be considered. Seshadri et al. is cited as teaching distinguishing one mobile from a plurality of mobile handsets to receive event information.

Thus, one skilled in the art would not combine these two references. These arguments apply to each of the independent claims 9, 16 and 22.

MPEP §706.02(j) states:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim

LUC-438/Benco 33-24-24-27

limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaack, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991)."

MPEP §2143.01 states:

"Obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either explicitly or implicitly in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The test for an implicit showing is what the combined teachings, knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, and the nature of the problem to be solved, as a whole would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. In re Kotzab, 217 F.3d 1365, 1370, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988); In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992)."

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, it must be demonstrate that all of the following elements: 1) suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the reference teachings; 2) reasonable expectation of success found in the prior art; and 3) the prior art references (combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Claims 24-27 are new and are believed to be allowable over the cited references. The Examiner is respectfully requested to indicate the allowability of new claims 24-27.

Applicants respectfully submit that the applied reference does not teach or suggest one or more elements of the claimed invention. The dependent claims are believed allowable for the

LUC-438/Benco 33-24-24-27

same reasons as the respective independent claims upon which they depend, as well as for their own additional characterizations.

For all the reasons presented above, the claims are believed neither anticipated nor obvious over the art of record. Withdrawal of the rejections is therefore respectfully requested. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is therefore respectfully requested. In view of the above remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered to be of general interest only. This application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,


John R. Garrett
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,888

Dated: January 9, 2007

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382